



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 155

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, JUNE 26, 2009

No. 98

Mr. BOEHNER. Let me thank my colleague for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I congratulate you on your upcoming marriage and your new job. All of us on the Republican side of the aisle thank you for your service to this institution and your service in the Chair. Good luck to you.

My colleagues, we've been through a very difficult time in our economy. We've had the great economic shocks of last fall, and we've seen unemployment climbing month after month after month. It is now at some 9.4 percent.

Earlier this year we passed a 1,100-page bill that no one read. It was supposed to be about putting the American people back to work again. It was supposed to be about stimulating our economy. And all we heard during that debate was about jobs, jobs and jobs. It's pretty clear that what the bill really ended up being was nothing more than spending, spending and more spending, because since that bill passed, some 1.7 million Americans have lost their jobs. So when we look at the legislation that continues to go through here, the American people are seeing an awful lot of spending, an awful lot of money going to government, but they're not seeing new jobs.

Now we come to what I believe is the most profound piece of legislation that has come to the floor of this House in the last 100 years. It's hard to say in the first 6 months of the new Congress that this could be the defining vote and the defining bill for this Congress, but I really, truly believe that this is the defining bill.

The problems that this bill attempts to go after are the issues of climate change and cleaning up our air, and, secondly, to build a new alternative energy industry in the United States. Those are really the two issues. Well, I guess a third issue would be jobs. Those are the goals that this bill attempts to go after. But when you look at the structure that's being built, it defies anyone's imagination to believe that the Federal Government could create such an elaborate process to deliver on those three goals.

I've got a chart here that goes through all of the agencies involved, all of the structures that are created under this bill. It's all being done, of course, by the Environmental Protection Agency. They are at the center of this.

But if you look at all of the different agencies involved, you will see that we've got the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission involved. We've got the United States Department of Agriculture that's going to be involved. The Internal Revenue Service will be engaged in this bill as well. The Department of the Treasury. I wish I could tell you what FWS was, but somebody could probably tell me. We have the Commodity Futures Trading Commission that's going to be involved in helping to regulate this.

The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the Weather Service, basically. The Department of Health and Human Services is going to be involved in putting this together. The Department of State will play a big role in making sure that we get cleaner air and green energy. We've got the Department of Energy, of course, the Department of Labor, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and the Bureau of Land Management. All these Federal agencies are going to take part in trying to put this bill into action.

But that's not all. Not even close. We've got the Offsets Integrity Advisory Board. We also have a Carbon Markets Oversight Interagency Working Group that is going to try to help control who gets these carbon credits and who doesn't, how they can be traded and how they can't, and where in the world these offsets are going to be.

They don't have to be in the United States. We're going to see billions of American tax dollars being shipped around the world. Whether it's replanting forests in other parts of the world, they're going to help clean up our air. I'm sure our constituents want our money being shipped overseas to plant trees.

But that's not all. That's not all. It's not even close. We've got the Consumer Refunds Fund that is going to be outlined here. We've got the International Reserve Allowance Program here. How about the domestic offset providers? We've got the offset traders and the national offset providers. We've got the Clean Vehicle Technical Advisory Board. We have a Carbon Capture Board. And it goes on and on and on.

This elaborate government structure that will cost the American people several trillion dollars over the next 10 years, all in an effort to clean up our air, will help build a new alternative energy industry in the United States and help create jobs in our country. I don't believe there are hardly any people in America who believe that this giant government bureaucracy is going to be able to deliver on the three goals that you outline.

And it's not just the cost, and it's not just the bureaucracy. Listen, there's not a Member in this body that doesn't want to improve the air quality in our country and around the world. There isn't a Member in this body who doesn't believe that speeding up the development of alternative sources of energy isn't good for America. No one. There's complete agreement on that.

But do we need to go through all of this? Do we need to have a national energy tax on every

person in America who would drive a car, who would flip on a light switch or who would buy an American-made product, because virtually every American-made product has an awful lot of energy in it.

That's not enough. If you look at this bill and you look at the analysis of this bill, you'll see that two-and-a-half million jobs on average will be lost each and every year over the next 10 years as a result of this bill. Some of those people happen to reside in my district, in Middletown, Ohio, where AK Steel is headquartered. They make steel the old-fashioned way. They bring in iron ore, coal and limestone. You get it hot enough, you've got steel. The cost of their steel will increase 30 to 40 percent if this bill were to pass. And at a time when we're trying to help the American automobile industry get back on its feet, the last thing they're going to do is pay 30 or 40 percent more for their steel.

So what are they going to do? They're going to bring it in from China, they'll bring it in from India, who are not burdened under this regulatory scheme, nor are they burdened under our current environmental regulations. So what happens is, high-energy jobs in America are going to get shipped overseas at exactly the wrong time.

The American people sent us here to help this economy, to get them back to work. This is the biggest job-killing bill that has ever been on the floor of the House of Representatives, right here, this bill, and I don't think that's what the American people want.

But if our goals are to clean up the air, to build a alternative energy business in the United States, a thriving one, and to create jobs, there's a better way to do this, and it's the all-of-the-above strategy that we've been talking about in this Chamber for nearly a year. That is to say, we need to have more alternative sources, whether they be solar, wind, geothermal.

We can produce those additional types of energy and help renew them. But, in the meantime, America needs energy to grow our economy, so we need to have more drilling for oil and gas in the United States. There's no question about it. We need to increase the supply of American-made energy so that we bring down the price.

What we do in our bill is, we take all the royalties from the development of additional oil and gas reserves in the United States and we plow it back into renewable sources of energy. As a result, our bill puts more money into renewables and speeding up the development of renewables at a faster pace than the bill on the floor of the House today.

That's not enough. We need to do all of the above. We need to develop clean coal technology. We need to be serious about nuclear energy. There's nothing in this bill before us that's going to allow us to produce nuclear energy in any kind of a quick way, or, frankly, any at all. But we all know it's the cleanest source of energy that we can have in the United States. So why shouldn't we do all of the above?

Because here's what all-of-the-above does for us: It gives us cleaner air. It gives us lower energy

prices. It really does move us quickly away from our dependence on all the foreign sources of oil that we have to rely on today. And it will do more in a very simple way than this big complex bureaucracy that is being outlined in this bill.

Why can't we do all of the above? Why do we have to try to establish this giant structure that attempts to put some cap in, but really doesn't, when we can do something simple that will help lower prices for Americans while cleaning up the air and moving us to alternative sources of energy. No, that's not what we're dealing with here today.

And if all of this wasn't enough, I woke up this morning and realized that last night at 3:09 a.m., a 300-page manager's amendment was dropped into the hopper, at 3:09 a.m.

I have spent most of the day trying to look at this 309-page bill and trying to come up with and understand what this 309-page amendment to the 1,200-page bill really does? As I started to go through this, I didn't get past the first page, where on page 16, line 5 strike 1992 and insert 1988, and on line 13 strike 1992 and insert 1988. This appears to deal with the hydropower, and I'm trying to figure out what is the impact of this date change? Nowhere in this manager's amendment can I find out what the impact of that is.

Then we get to page 2, not from components of the National Wilderness Preservation System, Wilderness Study Areas, Inventoried Roadless Areas or old growth stands and late-successional stands. So does this mean that renewable biomass is not defined by what it is but rather where it comes from? And why was this change made at 3:09 a.m. this morning?

We get to page 9, the President shall ensure that, of the total amount of electricity Federal agencies consume in the United States during each calendar year, the following percentage shall be renewable electricity.

We are going to mandate to every Federal agency how much electricity they buy that comes from renewable sources. And in here we have this year, 2012, 6 percent, 2013, 6 percent, 2014 we go to 9 1/2 percent, 2016 we go to 13 percent. 2018 we go to 16 1/2 percent. And 2020 through 2039, 20 percent of the electricity that goes into every Federal agency has to come from renewable sources. Do we have any idea whether this is possible? I can't find the answer here.

On Page 10 it says, contracts for renewable energy, a contract for the acquisition of electricity generated from a renewable energy resource for the Federal Government may be made for a period of not more than 20 years. Twenty-year contracts. What if the price of renewable energy goes down? Are taxpayers going to be stuck with a contract that is written today as opposed to what that contract could be negotiated for 10 years from now? I can't tell, because there is no answer here.

Or we get on page 12, renewable biomass. The term "renewable" means any of the following. And it goes through of this language. Of course, there is nothing renewable in a National

Wilderness Preservation System or a Wilderness Study Area or Inventoried Roadless Areas or old growth stands or late-successional stands except for dead, severely damaged or badly infested trees. Wasn't this the same language that we had on page 2? And why is it being repeated again? I can't tell as I read through this.

So we get to page 16, so that the vehicle or engine is capable of alternative fuel. First we are going to require now every car sold in America, it has to have an engine that is capable of operating on an alternative fuel. So what if you have a car that doesn't operate on a renewable fuel? Are we going to buy the car back from the American people? Are we going to reimburse them for their cost? I can't tell, because, again, this was dropped at 3:09 a.m., and no one probably has had a chance to read it.

How about on page 24, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums [Page: H7680] as may be necessary to carry out this paragraph. It sounds like a blank check to me.

Or on page 26, this section applies only to States located in the Western Interconnection and does not apply to States located in the Eastern Interconnection, to the States of Alaska or Hawaii or ERCOT. So are we going to have different rates for different parts of the country under this amendment that was filed at 3:09 a.m. this morning?

Then we get to Page 30. The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission shall act as the lead agency for purposes of coordinating all applicable Federal authorizations and related environmental reviews. So now we have FERC is in charge of coordinating environmental reviews, as I read this. Is that what Greenpeace demanded be part of this bill? Then we get to page 34. Page 34, it says not later than 1 year after August 8, 2005--

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend. Does the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. BOEHNER. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WAXMAN. The Republican leader was yielded the balance of the time, which I think amounted to around 4 or 5 minutes. He has talked for around 20. I know we have this "magic" minute that gives leaders a lot of extra time to speak, but I'm just wondering if there is some limit under the rules on the time that a leader may take, even though the time yielded was not 20 or 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is the custom of the House to hear the leaders' remarks.

Mr. WAXMAN. Further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. BOEHNER. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WAXMAN. I know it is the custom of the House to give a little extra latitude. Is there any outside limit to the amount of time a leader might take? And do we have historical records that might be broken tonight? Or is this an attempt to try to get some people to leave on a close vote?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is the custom of the House to hear the leaders' remarks.

Mr. BOEHNER. Reclaiming my time, the gentleman has had his 30 years to put this bill together, and the House is going to spend a whopping 5 hours debating the most profound piece of legislation to come to this floor in 100 years. And the chairman has the audacity to drop a 300-plus-page amendment in the hopper at 3:09 a.m. this morning. And so I would ask my colleagues, don't you think the American people expect us to understand what is in this bill before we vote on it?

So we get to page 34. Not 1 year after August 8, 2005. Now, wait a minute. One year later? One year after August of 2005? Wasn't that 3 years ago? I'm just trying to understand what the gentleman has in his amendment.

Then we get to page 36, high efficiency gas turbine research, development and demonstration. Now, I'm trying to figure out who inserted this broad new section of the bill that is covered nowhere in the underlying bill.

Then we get to page 39, \$65 million for each of the fiscal years 2011 through 2014, \$65 million for 3 years. And who is going to get this money? I can't tell in this amendment.

And as we go through this, page 41, determine any geographic area within the contiguous United States that lacks a Federal power marketing agency. Because, you know, we can't move power around the country without a Federal power marketing agency. We do it today, but now we have to have a new government agency to do this. We are doing it already.

Or same page, 41, the establishment of any new Federal lending authority, including authorization of additional lending authority for existing Federal agencies, not to exceed \$3.5 billion per geographic area identified in subsection (a)(1). This is \$3.5 billion in loans for each geographic area, but we don't know how many geographic areas are included or how many billions in total we are really talking about.

How about on page 42, any source of funds, including Federal funds provided through the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, shall qualify as the building owner's 50 percent contribution. Now, let me make sure I get this straight. So now you can use federal money for non-Federal matching requirements. How much is all of this going to cost?

Or on page 45--remember now, this is the amendment. This is not the bill. This is the amendment filed at 3:09 a.m. On Page 45, this section shall apply only to construction beginning after the date of enactment of this Act. For those of you who don't know it, all of

California housing standards are now going to be imposed on every American community. You don't have the right to have your own building standards in your community or in your State. Hell, no, the Federal Government is going to tell you what they are. And guess what? We all get to have California standards. Who is going to pay the price for those new homes? How are we going to do affordable housing when we are pushing up the cost of houses? And while I'm at it, we have to have an energy rating for every home in America. In this bill, we require every home to have an energy rating. And if you are going to sell your house, guess what? You have to have a review, bring people in, have them check out your windows, your appliances, your hot water heater, your door, make sure that your house is energy efficient. And guess what if it isn't? You have got to bring it up to standards before you can sell it. Now what kind of bizarre notion is that?

Well, we get to page 46 at the bottom, a plan for local governmental actions to be taken to establish and sustain local building code enforcement administration functions, without continuing Federal support, at a level at least equivalent to that proposed in the grant application. Do you all get that? It doesn't explain it. But here is what it is. The Federal Government is going to mandate all of these new standards on every house built in America. It is going to cost your local building department all kinds of money to enforce this and to revise their code. And when the money runs out, we are going to allow them to apply for a grant to the United States Government. I'm sure my constituents will love that.

Page 48, each building code enforcement department receiving a grant under subsection (a) shall empanel a code administration and enforcement team consisting of at least one full-time building code enforcement officer, a city planner, and a health planner or similar officer.

Now I have some big towns in my district. Hamilton, Middletown and Westchester can probably afford this new enforcement. But I can take you to Chickasaw, Mercer County, in my district. They don't have one full-time person that works for the village. Not one. Look at the mandate on every city and village in America right here in this bill.

So that we are not only going to tell you what the codes are going to be. But we are going to tell you how many people you need to hire to enforce this in this section of this code. See, we actually did take time, most of today, trying to understand what was in here.

How about on page 53, solar energy systems building permit requirements for receipt of community development block grants. So what are we doing here to amend the community development block grant program? Are we going to impose global warming requirements on all the cities who get CDBG monies from us? That is what it appears to say to me.

Or on page 54, any metropolitan city or urban county, during such fiscal year the cost of any permit or license, for construction or installation of any solar energy system for any structure, that is required by the metropolitan city or urban county, or by any other political subdivision of such city or county complies with paragraph (2).

So now we are going to tell them what to charge for their building permits as well in every city in America.

Then we get to page 56. The Secretary of Energy shall issue regulations to prohibit any private covenant, contract provision, lease provision, homeowners' association rule or bylaw.

Let me read this again: The Secretary of Energy here in Washington, [Page: H7681] DC, shall issue regulations to prohibit any private covenant, contract provision, lease provision, homeowners' association rule or bylaw. Just for those of you who didn't think there might not be a lot of government bureaucracy in this bill.

We get to page 63. The amount necessary to change consumer behavior to purchase water efficient products and services. So now--let me read this again and make sure that I am right. The amount necessary to change consumer behavior to purchase water efficient products and services. So we are going to provide the American people with money in order to change their behavior so they will buy goods and services that they don't want to buy.

I wonder how much that will cost.

Page 64, subsection 2, to create jobs through the retooling and expansion of manufacturing facilities to produce clean energy technologies to create jobs. So how many jobs is this going to create? Will it replace the 2.5 million jobs that will be lost each year as a result of this bill? I can't tell.

Now going to page 68, the Secretary shall award grants to States to establish revolving loan funds to provide loans to small and medium-sized manufacturers. So who is going to compensate manufacturers for putting them out of business with more loans?

Let me get to page 70. In particular, where mass layoffs have resulted in a precipitous increase in unemployment. So we have a provision in here that recognizes that millions of American jobs are going to be lost; but don't worry, don't worry, we are going to extend your unemployment. Most of my constituents who are unemployed don't want more unemployment. They want a job, and this is going to kill them.

I hate to do this to all of you, I do. I hate to do this, but when you file a 300-page amendment at 3:09 in the morning, somebody needs to work on it, and I worked on it today and I want to make sure that everybody understands what is in this 300-page amendment.

Page 76. Certification by Hollings Manufacturing Extension Center. A Hollings Manufacturing Extension Center or other entity designated by the Secretary for purposes of providing certification under clause so and so and so and so.

So now, why are we singling out one company, one company, and where did this company come from?

Further down the page on page 76, Repayment upon relocation outside the United States. In general. If a person receives a loan under paragraph (1) to finance the cost of reequipping, expanding, or establishing a manufacturing facility as described in subsection (c)(1)(A) or to reduce the energy intensity of a manufacturing facility and such person relocates the production activities of such manufacturing facility outside the United States.

So we recognize here that we are going to force companies to take their jobs and ship them overseas. It is right here. It is right here in the bill, and I am glad it is recognized by my colleagues.

Then we go to page 80, to support manufacturers in their identification of and diversification to new markets. Another admission that the bill before us is going to kill millions of small businesses and even tens of millions of jobs, so we have to have an effort in here to support manufacturers in their identification and diversification into new markets.

Then we get to page 83. Consumer Behavior Research. The Secretary of Energy is authorized to establish a research program to identify the factors affecting consumer actions to conserve energy and make improvements in energy efficiency. Through the program the Secretary will make grants to public and private institutions of higher education to study the effects of consumer behavior on total energy use.

Do we really need to spend government money to do a study on why people don't want to pay twice the cost and get half the quality?

Page 87, the development of a global framework for the regulation of greenhouse gas emissions from civil aircraft that recognizes the uniquely international nature of the industry and treats commercial aviation industries in all countries fairly.

Will this include China and India? I can't tell from the amendment that we have in front of us.

On page 92, we want to make sure that the structure have appropriate electrical outlets with the facility and capacity to recharge a standard electric passenger vehicle, including an electric hybrid vehicle, where such vehicle would normally be parked.

Oh, no, we are not just going to take the California standard and impose it on every community in America, oh, no. Now we are going to tell you where the electric outlets are going to be and how big they have to be to charge a hybrid vehicle.

I just don't understand whether this would apply to nursing homes where there are no cars.

Oh, here we are, page 96. Existing structures. For existing structures, a reduction in energy consumption from the previous level of consumption for the structure, as determined in accordance with energy audits performed both before and after any rehabilitation or

improvements undertaken to reduce such consumption, that exceeds the reduction necessary for compliance with the energy efficiency standards under subsection (a) then in effect and applicable to existing structures.

So not only are we going to tell every community in America what the building codes are going to be, what the efficiency standards are going to be, but if you make changes to your house, you have to have another study done to show how much increase in energy efficiency was gained. That will help sell a lot of new houses and a lot of old ones.

Page 97, for manufactured housing, energy star rating with respect to fixtures, appliances, and equipment in such housing, as such standard or successor standard is in effect for purposes of this section.

Please, is there anything that we are not regulating in this bill?

How about page 105. Waive or modify any existing statutory or regulatory provision that would otherwise impair the implementation or effectiveness of the demonstration program under this section, including provisions relating to methods for rent adjustments, comparability standards, maximum rent schedules, and utility allowances; notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this paragraph, the Secretary may not waive any statutory requirement relating to fair housing, nondiscrimination, labor standards, or the environment.

Now in implementing this demo program, rising rent can be dismissed out of hand, but labor standards or the environment cannot, as I read it.

Let me go to page 107. No amounts made available under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 can be used to carry out the demonstration program under this section.

So if no stimulus funds can be used, and the majority claims stimulus funds are for job creation, is this demo going to create one new job? I don't think so.

Page 112, additional credit for Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac housing goals for energy-efficient and location-efficient mortgages. Oh, yeah. Oh yeah, everybody listen up here. It is not enough that we have huge problems with Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, they are at the core of the credit meltdown we have had in our country, but we are going to give them a little more money so they can have goals for energy-efficient and location-efficient mortgages. Now we are going to tell Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac what kind of mortgages we are going to have in the marketplace.

How about page 113. Supports housing that complies with enhanced energy efficiency and conservation standards, or the green building standards, under section 284 of such Act.

This is the Federal Government using Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac to impose new Federal

building codes and standards across the country.

Let me go to page 114. The Federal Housing Enterprises Financial Safety and Soundness Act of 1992, as amended, by the Federal Housing Finance Regulatory Reform Act of 2008.

If this is supposed to be about energy, why are we further bogging it down with trying to solve problems for Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac?

Page 115, the term "energy-efficient mortgage" means a mortgage loan under which the income of the borrower, for purposes of qualification for such loan, is considered to be increased by not less than \$1 for each \$1 of savings projected to be realized by the borrower as a result of cost-effective energy-saving designs. [Page: H7682]

I'm sure that will create a lot of jobs.

And then we get to page 141, the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act is amended. Why are we amending the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act? I thought we were doing an energy bill here.

Page 142, use of building materials and methods that are healthier for residents of the housing, including the use of building materials that are free of added known carcinogens that are classified as Group 1 Known Carcinogens by the International Agency for Research on Cancer.

We are going to outline building materials as well, it appears.

Then we have a grant program to increase the sustainability of low-income community development capacity. We are going to provide loans, grants, or predevelopment assistance to eligible community development organizations or qualified youth service and conservation corps to carry out energy efficiency improvements.

I just want to know if ACORN would qualify for these grants.

And on page 146, we have another authorization here. There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this section \$10 million for each of the fiscal years 2010 through 2014.

So all the Members know, we have spent all of the year's income by April 16th. Everything we spend here, we have to borrow from our kids and grandchildren and the Chinese and everybody else who wants to loan us money.

Page 148, 25 points, in the case of any proposed plan, or portion thereof, consisting of new construction. So now we have a new government formula to determine winners and losers when it comes to the building of new houses.

Page 149, at the bottom, for purposes of this paragraph, the Secretary shall identify rating systems and levels for green buildings that the Secretary determines to be the most likely to encourage a comprehensive and environmentally sound approach to ratings and standards for green buildings.

So the government is going to decide what is green, not the American people.

In identifying these green rating systems, the Secretary has to take into consideration the ability and availability of assessors and auditors to independently verify the criteria and measurement of metrics at the scale necessary to implement this paragraph.

She also has to improve indoor and outdoor environmental quality through enhanced indoor and outdoor air quality, thermal comfort, acoustics, outdoor noise pollution, day lighting, pollutant source control, sustainable landscaping, and use of building system controls and low- or no-emission materials, and such other criteria as determined by the Secretary.

So why are we giving the Secretary all of this authority under this Act to determine virtually everything?

The Secretary may, by regulation, adopt and apply, for purposes of this paragraph, future amendments and supplements to, and editions of, the national Green Communities criteria checklist, any standard or standards that the Secretary has determined to be substantially equivalent to such checklist, and the green building ratings systems.

So a lot of power for the new Secretary without any congressional oversight.

Now I really hate to do this, but when you file a 300-page amendment at 3:09 a.m., the American people have a right to know what's in this bill and they have a right to know what we're voting on.

Let me get to the bottom of page 155:

Revision of Appraisal Standards. Each Federal financial institutions regulatory agency shall, not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, revise its standards for the performance of real estate appraisers in connection with federally related transactions under the jurisdiction of the agency to comply with the requirement under the amendments made by paragraph (1) of this subsection.

So now we have to retrain every appraiser in America so that they understand this law, so that they know how to properly appraise the value of someone's property. And they need to meet the requirements established pursuant to subsection (f) for qualifications regarding consideration of any renewable energy sources, or energy efficiency.

So every appraiser is not only going to be retrained but now we're going to have to send them

all to school.

Let me get to page 157: The Appraisal Subcommittee--another new part of the bureaucracy--shall establish requirements for State certification of State certified real estate appraisers and for State licensing of State licensed appraisers, to ensure that appraisers are qualified to consider, in determining the value of a property, any renewable energy sources for, or energy efficiency or energy-conserving improvements or features of, the property.

Interesting.

And the Secretary--on page 158--shall require the Housing Assistance Council to encourage each organization that receives assistance from the Council with any amounts made available from the Secretary to provide that any structures and buildings developed or assisted under projects, programs, and activities funded with such amounts complies with the energy efficiency standards under section 284(a) of this subtitle.

More power for a lot of unelected bureaucrats.

Then on page 160, the middle of the page, it says:

In General. The Secretary shall use amounts in the Fund to provide loans to States and Indian tribes to provide incentives to owners of single-family and multifamily housing, commercial properties, and public buildings to provide renewable energy sources, and it goes on and gives a whole long list. But there is no appropriation in here for it.

And then on page 164 we authorize another \$5 billion and there is no idea where this money comes from.

Page 165. Green Banking Centers. It's not going to do houses and commercial properties and multifamily housing. Now we're going to have Green Banking Centers.

The Federal banking agencies shall prescribe guidelines encouraging the establishment and maintenance of ``green banking'' centers by insured depository institutions to provide any consumer who seeks information on obtaining a mortgage, home improvement loan, home equity loan, or renewable energy lease with additional information.

Are you kidding me? I've heard of blackmail, but now I know what greenmail really is.

On page 170 at the top of the page, section 299F.

Government Accountability Office Reports on Availability of Affordable Mortgages.

Really. After we drive the price of every mortgage up in America, we're going to have them do a report on affordable mortgages. Guess what--they're going to be a hell of a lot more expensive.

You get to page 173.

The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may make commitments to a guarantee under this section and may guarantee the repayment of the portions of the principal obligations of eligible mortgages that are used to finance eligible sustainable building elements for the housing that is subject to the mortgage.

So now we're not only going to guarantee the mortgage but we're going to guarantee the improvements to the property as well.

Page 180. And I would direct all of your attention if you have a copy of this to section 3 of that page:

The full faith and credit of the United States is pledged to the payment of all guarantees issued under this section with respect to principal and interest.

The term "green portion" means, with respect to an eligible mortgage, the portion of the mortgage principal referred to in subsection (b)(2) that is attributable, as determined in accordance with regulations issued by the Secretary.

So we've got a new government program and we're going to guarantee this with the full faith and credit of the United States.

Then on page 184:

On April 1 (or a later date established by the administrator under subsection (j)) of the calendar year in which a term offset credit expires, the owner or operator holds for purposes of finally demonstrating compliance, an allowance or a domestic offset credit. [Page: H7683]

I read it because I cannot tell you what that means.

On page 190 at the bottom of the page it talks about algae.

And on page 189 we've got Renewable Biomass. This is the third definition of Renewable Biomass that we have just in the manager's amendment, much less in the bill.

This caught my attention, at the bottom of page 191, section 3, for vintage year 2012.

Are we talking about wine?

Then we get to page 208. Carbon Derivative Markets. Now we've already heard enough about credit default swaps, but I think most of you know that under this section, the Commodity

Exchange Act is amended by striking ``or an agricultural commodity" and inserting ``an agricultural commodity, or any emission allowance, compensatory allowance, offset credit, or Federal renewable electricity credit established or issued under this Act."

So now we're going to let those governed under the CFTC trade these credits with others around the world.

And on page 209 it talks about the effect of derivatives regulatory reform legislation. Upon passage of this legislation that includes derivatives, regulatory reform, sections 351, 352, 354, 355, 356 or 357 shall be repealed.

Any idea of the derivatives regulations that we're repealing in this bill? You probably didn't know we were doing that.

Then on page 210:

To prevent an increase in greenhouse gas emissions in countries other than the United States--I presume that means countries like India and China--to induce foreign countries, and, in particular, fast-growing developing countries, to take substantial action with respect to their greenhouse gas emissions.

India and China have made it perfectly clear to every one of us that they have no interest and will not go down this path.

It further goes on to ensure that the measures described in subpart 2 are designed and implemented in a manner consistent with applicable international agreements to which the United States is a party.

The very structure of the border provisions, however, makes this impossible to achieve. The Wall Street Journal said the other day and suggested that this bill really could start a trade war and that if we begin to try to impose our bureaucracy on other countries, we could just have that.

Let me get to page 225. Distribution of Emission Allowance Rebates. Further down the page, it says, Shall be pursuant to the entity's indirect carbon factor as calculated under subsection (b)(3).

Can anybody tell me how to calculate an indirect carbon factor or what an indirect carbon factor is?

Then we get to page 226. That more than 85 percent of United States imports for that sector are produced or manufactured in countries that have met one of the criteria in that section, then the 10-year reduction schedule set forth in this subsection shall begin in the next vintage year.

So now we're going to try to control imports from countries based on what they're doing with regard to their energy policy.

Use of Other Data to Determine Factor, page 231. Where it is not possible to determine the precise electricity emissions intensity factor for an entity using the methodology in clause (i). In what instances would it not be possible to determine what that is?

Then we get to page 233:

In each eligible industrial sector every 4 years, using an average of the four most recent years of the best available data. For purposes of the lists required to be published no later than February 1, 2013, the Administrator shall use the best available data for the maximum number of years, up to 4 years, for which data are available.

Why every 4 years? What's this data used for? Then it goes on: The Administrator shall limit the average direct greenhouse gas emissions per unit output, calculated under paragraph (4), for any eligible industrial sector to an amount that is not greater than it was in any previous calculation under this subsection.

So what is the cost of this provision?

Or on page 234: The Administrator shall use data from the greenhouse gas registry established under section 713. How much is this going to cost?

Promoting International Reductions in Industrial Emissions, page 236. Congress finds that for the purposes of this subpart, as set forth in section 761(c), can be most effectively addressed and achieved through agreements negotiated between the United States and foreign countries.

It is the policy of the United States to work proactively under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, and in other appropriate fora, to establish binding agreements, including sectoral agreements, committing all major greenhouse gas-emitting nations to contribute equitably to the reduction of global greenhouse emissions.

The bottom line of all of this is all pain for United States citizens and no gain.

Then we get to page 237: The President shall provide a notification on climate change described in paragraph (2) to each foreign country the products of which are not exempted under section 768.

This is less than a fig leaf here. They're trying to pretend that this notification will satisfy the consultation required by the WTO rules. It won't end there and it's going to result in retaliation against United States exports.

Then we get further down on that page: Requesting the foreign country to take appropriate measures to limit the greenhouse gas emissions in those countries.

So if they're really nice they won't have to but if we can, we can force them to adopt our bizarre regulatory scheme.

Then we get to page 238. United States Negotiating Objectives with Respect to Multilateral Environmental Negotiations.

So here we are telling the administration what their objectives are going to be as they negotiate environmental issues with other countries around the world.

Presidential Reports, page 239: Not later than January 1, 2017, and every 2 years thereafter, the President shall submit a report to Congress on the effectiveness of the distribution of emission allowance rebates under subpart 1 in mitigating carbon leakage in eligible industrial sectors.

Let me go to page 260: Modification of Earned Income Credit Amount For Individuals With No Qualifying Children.

Why does this bill neglect middle class families in America? Why is it that we're only going to help some people who will qualify for the earned income credit for individuals with no qualifying children?

Further down here it says: the Secretary determines experienced a reduction in purchasing power as a result of the provisions of this act.

That's a flat-out admission that every American is going to pay more for all of their energy. And it goes on and on and on.

Ladies and gentlemen, does this give you some idea of why the American people think their Congress is out of touch? The idea that the Federal Government can create this giant bureaucracy to try to control how much CO2 gets into atmosphere.

We know that if we were to do our all-of-the-above energy strategy, we'd see renewable sources of energy on the scene, available, producing jobs more quickly than under the underlying bill. We know that under our bill, you could actually have nuclear energy plants being built, cleaning up the air at a much faster rate than the underlying bill.

But there's really a big underlying difference between our approach and the approach of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, and that is trusting the American people. If we give the American people the right incentives, they'll make the right decisions. But that's not what we have on the floor today. What we have on the floor today is typical big government. And the fight that we have between the two sides of the aisle really boils down to one word: It boils

down to freedom. The freedom to allow the American people to live their lives without all of these extra taxes and all of this bureaucracy.

And I would just say to my colleagues, I did my best to try to get through the 300-page amendment that was filed at 3:09 in the morning. Obviously somebody knew this was coming, but it wasn't filed until 3:09 this morning.

This is not the way we should be doing legislation. The American people expect more of us. And you know what? They deserve a lot more from us.

So I would say to my colleagues let's not go down this path of increasing taxes on every single American. Let's not go down the path of moving millions of jobs to China, India, and other countries around the world. Let's trust the American people. Let's give them our all-of-the-above energy act and allow America to flourish, to allow jobs to flourish, and, most importantly, to allow freedom to flourish.